



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,346	01/15/2004	Peter Szpak	MWS-056	7444
959 7590 07/10/2007 LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP ONE POST OFFICE SQUARE BOSTON, MA 02109-2127			EXAMINER WATT, CHRIS A	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/759,346	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SZPAK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Chris Watt	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. ("Wang" US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0260700) in view of Courant et al. ("Courant" US Patent No. 5,522,073) and Kornerup et al. ("Kornerup" US Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0055666).

Regarding independent claim 1, Wang teaches in a graphical modeling environment having at least one model with a plurality of executable time-based components and which provides a view of the model, a method, comprising the steps of: monitoring the execution of said model to determine the occurrence of a specified event, said event referenced by a label; determining the occurrence of said specified event during the execution of said model (i.e. Event Monitor in Fig. 1 et seq. of Wang). Wang does not teach an event handler associated with the occurrence of an event, or the execution of components in response to notification of events.

Courant teaches posting the occurrence of said event in said graphical modeling environment to an event handler, said posting notifying said event handler of the occurrence of said event (i.e. "EVENT SERVER" and "EXECUTION MANAGER" in FIG. 5 et seq. of Courant). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the

Art Unit: 2174

invention to integrate the event manager of Courant into the graphical modeling environment of Wang. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Courant into Wang to give the user greater flexibility to select specific functions related to the event (i.e. see col. 2 line 33 et seq. of Courant).

Kornerup teaches executing at least one component from said plurality of components in response to said notifying, said component associated with said label (i.e. step 307 in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the execution based on the event of Kornerup into the graphical modeling environment of Wang as modified by Courant. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Kornerup into the modified Wang to give the user greater control over the timing relationship of the execution of specified events (i.e. see [0012] et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the further steps of: registering at least one of said plurality of components with said event handler; and receiving at the at least one of said plurality of components registering with said event handler, notification of the occurrence of said event following said posting (i.e. compare "MESSAGE CONNECTOR", "EVENT SERVER" and "EXECUTION MANAGER" in FIG. 5 et seq. of Courant).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the further step of: displaying a post component on said view, said post component specifying a condition causing said

posting to occur (i.e. compare "Event Occurred?" and "Clinical Event Monitor Notifies Server" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with views in Figs. 5-27 of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1, comprising the further step of: setting a sample time for the initial execution of at least one component to be the occurrence of the specified event (i.e. "timed loop ... in response to user input" in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 4, comprising the further step of: propagating the sample time to at least one other component in said model, said at least one other component configured to inherit a sample rate (i.e. "Associate graphical source code with the timed loop in response to user input" in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 4, comprising the further step of: setting a sample time of a plurality of non-contiguous components in said model to be the occurrence of said event (i.e. "Associate graphical source code with the timed loop in response to user input" in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 6 wherein said sample time for the plurality of non-contiguous components is set without adjusting visible connections between components displayed in said view (i.e. "Place Recommended Step in Prepared State" in preparation for "Override" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 4, comprising the further step of: indicating with an event ID in said view that the sample time of said at least one component is set to said event (i.e. "Store timing analysis data regarding timing" in Fig. 15 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 4 wherein said event is an explicit event set by a user (i.e. "in response to user input" in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 4 wherein said event is an implicit event caused by the execution of the model (i.e. "Recommended Guideline Step" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the implicit event is one of power-up, power-down and initialization (i.e. "Place Selected Step in Prepared State" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 10 wherein the implicit event corresponds to one of the enabling and disabling of a subsystem (i.e. "Trigger Specific Guideline Step" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 2, comprising the further step of: indicating which

Art Unit: 2174

event a component receives with a user-configurable color in said view (i.e. "color-coding scheme" in [0248] et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 14, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1, wherein an execution scope of the specified event for which the execution of the model is being monitored is restricted to a portion of the model (i.e. "Clinical Event Monitor" in Fig. 2 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1 wherein each event in said model maps on a one-to-one basis to an event handler, said event handler being a function (i.e. compare "ROUTINE MANAGER" and "EVENT SERVER" in FIG. 6 et seq. of Courant).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 15 wherein said function is inlined (i.e. see Figs. 5-27 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1 wherein a branch priority block indicates an order of execution among at least two branches of blocks in response to said notifying (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding dependent claim 18, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 1 wherein more than one block group executes in response to said notifying, said block groups being a user selected grouping of blocks, the order of execution of the block groups specified by a user (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding independent claim 19. In a modeling environment having at least one model with a plurality of executable components; a method, comprising the steps of: monitoring the execution of said model to determine the occurrence of a specified event (i.e. Event Monitor in Fig. 1 et seq. of Wang). Wang does not teach an event handler associated with the occurrence of an event, or the execution of components in response to notification of events.

Courant teaches interrupting execution of an executing event in response to the determination of the occurrence of said specified event; and performing an operation in said model in response to the determination of the occurrence of the specified event (i.e. "EVENT SERVER" and "EXECUTION MANAGER" in FIG. 5 et seq. of Courant). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the event manager of Courant into the graphical modeling environment of Wang. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Courant into Wang to give the user greater flexibility to select specific functions related to the event (i.e. see col. 2 line 33 et seq. of Courant).

Kornerup teaches determining the occurrence of said specified event during the execution of said model (i.e. step 307 in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the execution based on the event of Kornerup into the graphical modeling environment of Wang as modified by Courant. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Kornerup into the modified Wang to give the user greater control over the timing relationship of the execution of specified events (i.e. see [0012] et seq. of Kornerup).



Regarding dependent claim 20, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said specified event is treated as a normal event and comprising the further step of: resuming execution of the interrupted event (i.e. "Wait for the Occurrence of the Event" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said specified event is treated as an exception event and comprising the further step of: returning control of the execution of the model to a calling process which called the interrupted executing event without resuming execution of said interrupted event (i.e. compare "Wait for the Occurrence of the Event" with "Trigger Specific Guideline Step" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 22, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 19 wherein said specified event is specified using an instantiated event object (i.e. "Place Recommended Step in Prepared State" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 23, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 22 wherein said event is an explicit event (i.e. "in response to user input" in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 22 wherein said event is an implicit event (i.e. "Recommended Guideline Step" in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang).

Regarding dependent claim 25, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 22 wherein said event object is associated with a

Art Unit: 2174

task object, said task object corresponding to an operating system task (i.e. "may also store operating system software" in [0104] et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 26, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 25 wherein said task object has at least one of a specified execution rate and priority (i.e. "Display a timed loop in a graphical program in response to user input in Fig. 6 et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 27, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 26 wherein at least two events with different tasks are executing in a model and comprising the further step of: using event transition components to schedule the execution of components associated with said at least two events, said event transition components separating the execution of said components associated with said at least two events (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding dependent claim 28, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 19 wherein the operation is controlled by an order of execution indicated in a branch priority block (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding dependent claim 29, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the method of claim 19 wherein the operation is the execution of more than one block group, said block groups being a user selected grouping of blocks, the order of execution of the block groups specified by a user (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding independent claim 30, Wang teaches in a modeling environment, a system, comprising: at least one graphical model with a plurality of executable components (i.e. see Figs. 5-27 et seq. of Wang). Wang does not teach an event handler associated with the occurrence of an event, or the execution of components in response to notification of events.

Courant teaches an event handler, said event handler receiving notice from said model of the occurrence of a specified event; and at least one receiving component, said receiving block receiving notification from said event handler regarding the occurrence of said specified event (i.e. "EVENT SERVER" and "EXECUTION MANAGER" in FIG. 5 et seq. of Courant). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the event manager of Courant into the graphical modeling environment of Wang. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Courant into Wang to give the user greater flexibility to select specific functions related to the event (i.e. see col. 2 line 33 et seq. of Courant).

Kornerup teaches executing in response to said notification (i.e. step 307 in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the execution based on the event of Kornerup into the graphical modeling environment of Wang as modified by Courant. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Kornerup into the modified Wang to give the user greater control over the timing relationship of the execution of specified events (i.e. see [0012] et seq. of Kornerup).

Regarding dependent claim 31, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the system of claim 30 wherein said event is an error event stemming from the execution of the model (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding dependent claim 32, Wang, in combination with Courant and Kornerup teaches the system of claim 30 wherein the occurrence of said specified event causes more than one component in said model to execute (i.e. compare flow chart in Fig. 4 et seq. of Wang with Figs. 5-27).

Regarding independent claim 33, Wang teaches in an electronic device a medium holding a graphical modeling environment having at least one model with a plurality of executable time-based components, said graphical modeling environment providing a view of the model, said medium holding executable steps for a method, said method comprising the steps of: monitoring the execution of said model to determine the occurrence of a specified event, said event referenced by a label; determining the occurrence of said specified event during the execution of said model (i.e. Event Monitor in Fig. 1 et seq. of Wang). Wang does not teach an event handler associated with the occurrence of an event, or the execution of components in response to notification of events.

Courant teaches posting the occurrence of said event in said modeling environment to an event handler, said posting notifying said event handler of the occurrence of said event (i.e. "EVENT SERVER" and "EXECUTION MANAGER" in FIG. 5 et seq. of Courant). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the

Art Unit: 2174

invention to integrate the event manager of Courant into the graphical modeling environment of Wang. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Courant into Wang to give the user greater flexibility to select specific functions related to the event (i.e. see col. 2 line 33 et seq. of Courant).

Kornerup teaches executing at least one component from said plurality of components in response to said notifying, said component associated with said label (i.e. step 307 in Fig. 5 et seq. of Kornerup). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to integrate the execution based on the event of Kornerup into the graphical modeling environment of Wang as modified by Courant. Said artisan would have been motivated to combine Kornerup into the modified Wang to give the user greater control over the timing relationship of the execution of specified events (i.e. see [0012] et seq. of Kornerup).

Claim 34 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 3, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 5, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 40 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 9, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 42 is similar in scope to claim 10, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 43 is similar in scope to claim 11, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 44 is similar in scope to claim 12, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 45 is similar in scope to claim 13, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 46 is similar in scope to claim 14, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 47 is similar in scope to claim 15, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 48 is similar in scope to claim 16, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 49 is similar in scope to claim 17, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 50 is similar in scope to claim 18, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 51 is similar in scope to claim 19, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 52 is similar in scope to claim 20, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 53 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 54 is similar in scope to claim 22, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 55 is similar in scope to claim 23, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 56 is similar in scope to claim 24, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 57 is similar in scope to claim 25, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 58 is similar in scope to claim 26, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 59 is similar in scope to claim 27, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 60 is similar in scope to claim 28, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 61 is similar in scope to claim 29, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chris Watt whose telephone number is (571) 270-1046. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-4:00 Eastern.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris A. Watt/

June 20, 2007

CAW

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100